

Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

[Post Reply](#) [Search this topic...](#)

272 posts [1](#) ... [15](#) [16](#) [17](#) [18](#) [19](#)

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by [daniel j lavender](#) » Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am



[daniel j lavender](#)

Posts: 129
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact: [Contact](#)

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

Age wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:20 pm

Is 'this' WHAT you think I have been talking ABOUT?

No, I was simply identifying the fallacy in your particular statement there.

WHERE is the SUPPOSED 'fallacy' in my particular statement here?

The statement referenced with fallacy in bold:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 11:13 am

Age wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 10:14 am

...While, ALSO, REVEALING that if you ACTUALLY KNEW what ALL 'things' were constitutionally made up of...

All things are *all things*. They are not "made up of". They would already be *all things*.

In other words there's no more things than all things.

Again, all things are all things. "All things" implicitly includes constituent parts. Suggesting all things are "made up of" is redundant.

All things would not be "constitutionally made up of", as you state, *as they would already be all things*.

You fallaciously suggest "all things" would be "made up of" additional things or other things or something else.

Or, if you wish, *you* could clarify and explain to readers how all things could be "made up of" or what you really meant by your statement.

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

As you admit here, you were attempting to have me state "immaterial expanse consists of nothing" which would apparently reveal nothing exists.

Well you have YET to INFORM the 'readers' here 'what' 'immaterial expanse', CONSISTS OF, CONSTITUTIONALLY MADE UP OF, is COMPOSED OF, or IS 'what', (in relation to ANY other 'terms' or 'words' that you would like to ADD IN here).

I have:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Sat Jul 01, 2023 7:23 am

Immaterial expanse consists of immaterial expanse. As stated, immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse. As with physical material, immaterial expanse can be broken down into or can be measured as smaller units or smaller regions, however it's still immaterial expanse.

One could ask "What does X consist of?" And receive response "Y". One could ask "What does Y consist of?" And receive response "Z". One could ask "What does Z consist of?" and continue down the path of madness. I will not entertain such nonsense here.

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

And, this IS BECAUSE 'immaterial expanse' does NOT CONSIST OF absolutely ANY 'thing', OBVIOUSLY.

BUT, if you want to KEEP CLAIMING that 'this' is false, wrong, or incorrect, then, PLEASE, by ALL MEANS SHOW and PROVE otherwise.

See above.

As discussed that terminology is redundant. Immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse. Immaterial expanse doesn't necessarily "consist of". Immaterial expanse is about as basic as it gets, as stated here:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Wed Jun 28, 2023 8:59 am

Immaterial expanse is about as simple, is about as basic as it gets, hence the trouble simplifying or breaking it down further.

Again, you are arguing that an elemental thing is not a thing because it cannot be broken down or simplified further. In essence you are *arguing that a basic thing is not a thing, or is based on nothing or nonexistence, because it cannot be any more basic*. That is a fallacious argument.

Immaterial expanse is a rather basic aspect of existence, but not a nonexistent aspect of existence.

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

Immateriality is not nothing or nonexistence.

BUT, 'you' can NOT tell 'us' what 'immateriality' IS, EXACTLY, HOW 'it' EXISTS, NOR 'what' IS EXISTING, EXACTLY, right?

This has already been discussed: [viewtopic.php?p=653291#p653291](#)

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

Immaterial expanse is a thing, not no thing.

Nothing, the term, the concept, is a thing, not no thing.

The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.

That areas or expanses are perceived and acknowledged here illustrates they are indeed things *by definition*:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm

Thing (n.): An existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. **That which is perceived or interacted with**, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etc.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm

Things have properties, things have qualities. Stars are bright. Icicles are cold. The automobile is aerodynamic. Nothing or nonexistence, beyond the concept or term, has no properties or qualities as it does not actually exist.

You may disagree however that is how the terms are defined within the philosophy.

Regardless your opinion area or expanse is indeed a thing. By definition.

Apparently you ultimately agree area or expanse is a thing:

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

The areas, or expanses...IS ALSO A 'thing'

...so nothing still does not exist per your own admission.

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.

To emphasize these areas, these regions of *immaterial expanse*, not nothing, have qualities. Immaterial expanse has properties. Immaterial expanse is immaterial. Immaterial expanse is voluminous.

Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no qualities or properties.

Immaterial expanse can be measured. It can be measured as the area or distance between or among masses or objects (material things) similar to the way other things are measured. Expanse can be measured arbitrarily from one point to another. In the hypothetical case of a single physical object or most-distant object expanse can be measured from that point beyond and considered to be indefinite from that point.

Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no extent or capacity to be measured.

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

Every thing is some thing. All that is is existence. Nothing, nonexistence is not and cannot be.

LOL

Can you REALLY STILL NOT YET SEE your VERY OWN CONTRADICTION here, ONCE AGAIN?

No, and that is precisely the point.

I don't see a contradiction. I see *congruency*.

See "nothing"? See the term? I *perceive* it. You *perceive* it. You *typed* it. It is perceived and interacted with. That is, by definition, a thing. Not no thing.

I see no contradiction. I see congruency.

Congruency illustrating existence is infinite as nothing is not and cannot be.

Even the term "nothing" itself is a testament to the prevalence of existence.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am



Age

Posts: 16527

Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

No, I was simply identifying the fallacy in your particular statement there.

WHERE is the SUPPOSED 'fallacy' in my particular statement here?

The statement referenced with fallacy in bold:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 11:13 am

Age wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 10:14 am

...While, ALSO, REVEALING that if you ACTUALLY KNEW what ALL 'things' were constitutionally made up of...

All things are *all things*. They are not "made up of". They would already be *all things*.

So, to you, ALL 'things' are made up of ALL 'things', right or wrong?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

In other words there's no more things than all things.

ONCE AGAIN, you are completely and utterly MISUNDERSTANDING here.

BUT, this is JUST NORMAL for one who BELIEVES that they ALREADY KNOW the truth of 'things', like you are SHOWING and EXAMPLING here.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Again, all things are all things. "All things" implicitly includes constituent parts. Suggesting all things are "made up of" is redundant. Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

AGAIN, if you ALREADY KNEW what ALL 'things' were made up of, EXACTLY, then you would NOT be SAYING 'things' such as and like, 'All things are all things'.

you are sounding like one who CLAIMS to KNOW 'things', BUT, WHEN QUESTIONED just SAYS, 'But that is just the way things are'.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
All things would not be "constitutionally made up of", as you state, *as they would already be all things*. Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

LOL EVERY 'thing' IS made up of at least two OTHER 'things', EXCEPT, OF COURSE, for the TWO FUNDAMENTAL 'things' of the Universe, Itself.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
You fallaciously suggest "all things" would be "made up of" additional things or other things or something else. Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

BUT what you call 'my fallacy' is ONLY what you ASSUME I am SAYING, and MEANING, here. However, what I am ACTUALLY ASKING, SAYING, and MEANING is DIFFERENT FROM what you ARE ASSUMING, and/or BELIEVING, here.

I will now suggest TO 'you' what I suggest TO "others", and that IS it is MUCH BETTER if you SEEK OUT, GAIN, and OBTAIN ACTUAL CLARITY, FIRST, BEFORE you ASSUME absolutely ANY 'thing' here.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Or, if you wish, you could clarify and explain to readers how all things could be "made up of" or what you really meant by your statement. Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

YES, I AGREE I COULD DO 'this' here. However, CONSIDERING that absolutely NO one has ASKED me FOR ANY SPECIFIC CLARIFICATION, NOR FOR ANY SPECIFIC EXPLANATION, here, then I WILL CONTINUE TO JUST WAIT.

I am NOT going to EXPLAIN 'things' here if NO is Truly INTERESTED, and, OBVIOUSLY, if one is ALREADY BELIEVING that they KNOW what the truth is here, then they would NOT be Truly INTERESTED in ANY 'thing' DIFFERENT.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

Well you have YET to INFORM the 'readers' here 'what' 'immaterial expanse', CONSISTS OF, CONSTITUTIONALLY MADE UP OF, is COMPOSED OF, or IS 'what', (in relation to ANY other 'terms' or 'words' that you would like to ADD IN here).

I have:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Immaterial expanse consists of immaterial expanse. As stated, immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse. Sat Jul 01, 2023 7:23 am

Do 'you' KNOW what 'you' sound like here "daniel j lavender"?

If no, then, to me, you sound JUST LIKE the "preacher" who CLAIMS, 'God created the Universe/everything', but WHEN QUESTIONED, 'But who created God?', and the reply comes back something like; 'It just is what it is', and/or, 'There are somethings that we are just NOT meant TO KNOW'.

So, in other words, what you are essentially SAYING here is like, 'God created the Universe, because God is God and God can create anything. God created the Universe, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known'.

Or, as you ARE SAYING here, 'existence consists of an immaterial expanse, because existence could NOT exist without an immaterial expanse and existence is all things. Immaterial expanse is an immaterial expanse, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known here.

The CIRCULAR REASONING, with both, IS THE SAME.

The INCONSISTENCIES, within both, are more or less THE SAME. AND,

The CONTRADICTION, itself, IS more or less THE SAME.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
As with physical material, immaterial expanse can be broken down into or can be measured as smaller units or smaller regions, however it's still immaterial expanse. Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

So what? And, OBVIOUSLY.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
One could ask "What does X consist of?" And receive response "Y". Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

But WHAT ELSE plus "Y"?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
One could ask "What does Y consist of?" And receive response "Z". Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

But WHAT ELSE plus "Z"?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
One could ask "What does Z consist of?" and continue down the path of madness. Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

LOL Spoken like one who Truly DOES NOT YET KNOW.

AGAIN, 'you' are sounding just like the "preacher" WHEN QUESTIONED and CHALLENGED OVER and ABOUT the CLAIMS 'they' MAKE, ALSO.

I WILL AGAIN SUGGEST that 'you', people, here OBTAIN the ACTUAL IRREFUTABLE Truth of what 'it' is that you want to SAY and CLAIM IS TRUE, BEFORE, you come onto a public forum, especially, and CLAIM that 'it' (whatever) IS TRUE.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
I will not entertain such nonsense here. Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Will considering that 'you' are the ONLY one here thinking and SEEING 'things' THIS WAY, then the ONLY one who ENTERTAINED THIS WAY is 'you' ALONE "daniel j lavender".

AGAIN, I will suggest that you NOT ASSUME some 'thing' BEFORE you START BELIEVING, and thus ENTERTAINING, ANY IDEAS.

LOOK, if you do NOT YET KNOW what the Universe, FUNDAMENTALLY, consists of and is thus made up of, EXACTLY, then to NOT be to concerned NOR worried ABOUT 'this', as NO OTHER human being DID neither, in the days when this was being written.

BUT, WHEN 'you', human beings, do evolve MORE, further along the path, THEN 'you' WILL SEE the ACTUAL Truth of 'things', which I HAVE BEEN ALLUDING TO here.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

And, this IS BECAUSE 'immaterial expanse' does NOT CONSIST OF absolutely ANY 'thing', OBVIOUSLY.

BUT, if you want to KEEP CLAIMING that 'this' is false, wrong, or incorrect, then, PLEASE, by ALL MEANS SHOW and PROVE otherwise.

See above.

LOL

This is YOUR so-called 'reasoning' here "daniel j lavender"; 'immaterial expanse IS immaterial expanse' BECAUSE I SAY 'it' IS.

Which is JUST LIKE the "preacher" so-call 'reasoning'; 'God exists' BECAUSE I SAY 'It' DOES.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

As discussed that terminology is redundant.

ONLY in YOUR OWN MADE UP and BELIEVED 'world' and 'view' of 'things' here.

JUST LIKE ALL 'terminology is redundant' if 'that terminology' does NOT FIT IN WITH ANY one "else's" BELIEFS and/or MADE UP 'world view' of 'things'.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse.

JUST LIKE, God is simply God, right?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Immaterial expanse doesn't necessarily "consist of".

REALLY?

So, are you SAYING, and now CLAIMING, that there ARE 'things', EXISTING, which do NOT necessarily 'consist of' absolutely ANY 'thing'?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Immaterial expanse is about as basic as it gets, as stated here:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Wed Jun 28, 2023 8:59 am

Immaterial expanse is about as simple, is about as basic as it gets, hence the trouble simplifying or breaking it down further.

Okay. Now, let us LOOK AT 'this' FROM ANOTHER perspective, or IN ANOTHER way.

Existence consists of 'things' and of NO 'things' BECAUSE 'this' is about as simple, and is about as basic as 'it' gets, hence the, IMAGINED, BELIEVED, and self-PROCLAIMED, 'trouble' simplifying or breaking 'it' down further.

If you can NOT EXPLAIN 'it', in an IRREFUTABLE WAY, SIMPLY, then HOW WELL do 'you', REALLY, KNOW 'the subject' here?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Again, you are arguing that an elemental thing is not a thing because it cannot be broken down or simplified further.

BESIDES 'this' CLAIM here being ANOTHER CLAIMS of 'YOURS', which IS ABSOLUTELY False, Wrong, AND Incorrect, 'this CLAIM' IS ALSO Truly ABSURD and ILLOGICAL, to say the least.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

In essence you are *arguing that a basic thing is not a thing, or is based on nothing or nonexistence, because it cannot be any more basic.*

This' would be one the MOST IDIOTIC ASSUMPTIONS that I have SEEN here, in this forum, in relation to what I HAVE BEEN SAYING, and MEANING.

By the way, and in case you ARE STILL UNAWARE, what you ARE ASSUMING here could NOT get ANY FURTHER AWAY FROM the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

That is a fallacious argument.

Well, considering that 'that argument' exists in 'that head' ONLY, if 'it' IS 'fallacious', or NOT, is of 'your' MAKING ONLY.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Immaterial expanse is a rather basic aspect of existence, but not a nonexistent aspect of existence.

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

Immateriality is not nothing or nonexistence.

BUT, 'you' can NOT tell 'us' what 'immateriality' IS, EXACTLY, HOW 'it' EXISTS, NOR 'what' IS EXISTING, EXACTLY, right?

This has already been discussed: viewtopic.php?p=653291#p653291[/quote]

As I JUST SAID, 'you' can NOT tell 'us' what 'immateriality' IS, EXACTLY, et cetera, et cetera.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Age wrote: ↑
Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

Immaterial expanse is a thing, not no thing.

Nothing, the term, the concept, is a thing, not no thing.

The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.

That areas or expanses are perceived and acknowledged here illustrates they are indeed things *by definition*:

GREAT.

This' IS what I have been SAYING and POINTING OUT here, and I am GLAD that you are now ACKNOWLEDGING 'this' ALSO here.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm

Thing (n.): An existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. **That which is perceived or interacted with**, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etc.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm

Things have properties, things have qualities.

BUT, you WILL NOT TELL 'us' what the 'properties' AND 'quality' OF 'immaterial expanse' IS, EXACTLY.

This is BECAUSE you CAN NOT, and you CAN NOT, BECAUSE you do NOT YET KNOW "yourself".

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Stars are bright. Icicles are cold. The automobile is aerodynamic. Nothing or nonexistence, beyond the concept or term, has no properties or qualities as it does not actually exist.

SO, and LAUGHINGLY, ONCE AGAIN, you CLAIM that 'nothing' IS A 'thing', EXISTS, and IS A PART OF 'existence', itself, BUT that 'nothing', or 'nonexistence' does NOT ACTUALLY EXIST.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

You may disagree however that is how the terms are defined within the philosophy.

LOL WITHIN 'whose, so-called, philosophy?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Regardless your opinion area or expanse is indeed a thing. By definition.

This' goes WITHOUT SAYING, regardless of YOUR opinion.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Apparently you ultimately agree area or expanse is a thing:

What do you MEAN by 'apparently?

Is there ABSOLUTELY ANY 'thing' that I have EVER SAID or WRITTEN here that would even SUGGEST otherwise?

If yes, then WHERE and WHEN, EXACTLY?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

The areas, or expanses...IS ALSO A 'thing'

...so nothing still does not exist per your own admission.

LOL The MORE you ASSUME 'things' here and the MORE you 'TRY TO' SPEAK FOR me, the MORE WRONG and INCORRECT you ARE.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'. Although you STILL, currently, BELIEVE otherwise.

To emphasize these areas, these regions of *immaterial expanse*, not nothing, have qualities. Immaterial expanse has properties. Immaterial expanse is immaterial. Immaterial expanse is voluminous.

SO, what ARE the, EXACT, QUALITIES and the, EXACT, PROPERTIES OF what you call 'immaterial expanse' here?

1. Is 'voluminous' right?

If yes, then what ELSE, EXACTLY?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no qualities or properties.

If you SAY SO.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Immaterial expanse can be measured. It can be measured as the area or distance between or among masses or objects (material things) similar to the way other things are measured.

We ARE getting CLOSER. But it HAS TAKEN QUITE A WHILE.

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Expanse can be measured arbitrarily from one point to another. In the hypothetical case of a single physical object or most-distant object expanse can be measured from that point beyond and considered to be indefinite from that point.

Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no extent or capacity to be measured.

So, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'nothingness' IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY TO EXIST, right?

Either way, BUT, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' NOT just CAN exist but ACTUALLY DOES EXIST, right?

Either way, AND, you BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', BUT, 'an area' of 'nothing' can NOT BE A 'thing', right?

“

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

“

Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

“

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Every thing is some thing. All that is is existence. Nothing, nonexistence is not and cannot be.

Thu Jul 20, 2023 6:40 pm

LOL

Can you REALLY STILL NOT YET SEE your VERY OWN CONTRADICTION here, ONCE AGAIN?

No, and that is precisely the point.

I don't see a contradiction. I see *congruency*.[/quote]

GREAT.

Here we have ANOTHER GREAT example of when one is currently BELIEVING SOME 'thing' IS TRUE, then 'they' are NOT ABLE TO SEE the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'. 'This phenomena' can be CLEARLY SEEN by THE WAY 'this one' PRESENTS 'its' ASSUMPTIONS and BELIEFS here. That is; even when an IRREFUTABLE INCONSISTENCY or CONTRADICTION in what they are SAYING, and CLAIMING, based off of their OWN ASSUMPTION or BELIEF, is ABSOLUTELY BLINDINGLY OBVIOUS TO "others", 'that one' REMAINS COMPLETELY OBLIVIOUS TO the FALLACIES in what 'it' IS SAYING, and CLAIMING, as well as to the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'.

OF COURSE 'you' ONLY SEE 'congruence' here. This IS BECAUSE you have DEFINED 'words' and 'terms' IN A WAY that FIT IN WITH what you HAD ALREADY CONCLUDED, and are now CURRENTLY BELIEVING, IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE here.

you have MADE UP and CREATED these Truly INCONSISTENT, CONTRADICTIONARY, and INCONGRUENT DEFINITIONS FOR 'words' and 'terms' here BECAUSE you HAD ALREADY a PREEXISTING BELIEF that 'nothing' and 'something' DO NOT EXIST and COULD NOT EVER EXIST.

BUT, TO OVERCOME this Truly CONTRADICTIONARY and False CLAIM, you MADE UP the 'concept' that 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', and EXISTS, BUT WHILE NEVER BEING ABLE TO EXPLAIN what 'immaterial expanse' is ACTUALLY MADE UP OF 'itself'.

BECAUSE IF you EVER DID, then the CONTRADICTION WOULD BE here for ALL OF 'us' TO LOOK AT and SEE.

SO, you WILL just CONTINUE ON the WAY you HAVE BEEN and ARE here now. BECAUSE to do OTHERWISE would, LITERALLY, BE the DEATH or END of 'you'.

(BUT because 'you' do NOT YET KNOW and UNDERSTAND WHO and WHAT the 'you' IS, EXACTLY, what I just SAID here WOULD BE and IS BEING LOST ON just about ALL of the 'human beings', BACK in the days when this was being written.)

“

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

See "nothing"? See the term? I perceive it. You perceive it. You typed it. It is perceived and interacted with. That is, by definition, a thing. Not no thing.

I see no contradiction. I see congruency.

GREAT. KEEP SEEING so-called 'congruency'.

The people WHO BELIEVED the earth revolves around the sun ALSO SAW so-called 'congruency'.

“

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Congruency illustrating existence is infinite as nothing is not and cannot be.

“

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Even the term "nothing" itself is a testament to the prevalence of existence.

SO, ONCE AGAIN, we find 'ourselves' with even FURTHER PROOF that, ACTUALLY, WITHOUT 'nothing' there IS NO 'Existence', well NOT in the WAY 'Existence' EXISTS NOW, HERE, anyway.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Wizard22 » Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am

“

Age wrote: ↑

Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:35 pm

BUT there IS A BEGINNING, which is ALSO IRREFUTABLY True.

Really? Where? When?

See, Age, you do have Beliefs after all. Maybe you weren't self-conscious to see them in yourself, but here they are. You believe in "A BEGINNING".

Why?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:14 am

“

Wizard22 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am

“

Age wrote: ↑

Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:35 pm

BUT there IS A BEGINNING, which is ALSO IRREFUTABLY True.

Really? Where? When?

GREAT CLARIFYING QUESTIONS. PITY that they were NOT ASKED from the OPEN perspective, and so the ACTUAL ANSWER PROVIDED WILL BE CLEARLY MISSED and/or MISUNDERSTOOD, by 'you'.

SEE, 'your' BELIEFS here are just being HELD ONTO TO STRONGLY, and so are COMING ACROSS SO OBVIOUS, AS WELL, that to TELL 'you' WHERE and WHEN 'the beginning' IS, EXACTLY, 'you' WILL NOT BE ABLE TO SEE, NOR HEAR, IT' as well as be ABLE TO COMPREHEND and UNDERSTAND IT'.

As I WILL now SHOW and PROVE.

To ANSWER 'your' OBVIOUSLY VERY CLOSED QUESTIONING here.

1. YES, there REALLY IS A BEGINNING.

2. WHERE THE BEGINNING IS, IS HERE.

3. WHEN THE BEGINNING IS, IS NOW.

ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL BE, and ALWAYS IS 'The BEGINNING' HERE, NOW.

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

See, Age, you do have Beliefs after all. Maybe you weren't self-conscious to see them in yourself, but here they are. You believe in "A BEGINNING".

Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am

LOL 'you' are like A PRIME 'subject' FOR me here is SHOWING and PROVING just how STUPID and RIDICULOUS BELIEFS and/or ASSUMPTIONS can MAKE one REALLY BECOME, and BE.

1. you ASK A QUESTION, or three, here, do NOT WAIT for MY RESPONSE, proceed to CARRY ON as though you KNOW what THE ANSWER/S is/are, and then CLAIM that 'this' is some sort of PROOF that I HAVE some sort of BELIEF here. Which is even MORE STUPID and MORE FOOLISH when I put 'this' IN WRITING then 'it' WAS when I READ what you WROTE here.

2. HOW does just writing, what I DID above here somehow MEAN, IRREFUTABLY, that I DO HAVE 'Beliefs', (capital 'B'), after all? (I CAN and WILL SHOW just how Truly ABSURD and RIDICULOUS 'this statement' AND 'CLAIM' IS, AFTER 'you' PROVIDE 'us' WITH 'your' REASONING for HOW and WHY what I WROTE MEANS, TO 'you', that I now have A 'Belief', after all.

3. 'you' are NOT even REMOTELY CLOSE to BEING 'self-aware' and/or 'self-conscious' ENOUGH to even BEGIN TO RECOGNIZE, SEE, and UNDERSTAND HOW, and WHY, I have being USING 'you' to SHOW and PROVE what I AM here, now. Let alone 'you' CLAIMING what 'you' ARE here ABOUT 'me' NOT being ABLE TO SEE that 'I' have 'Beliefs'.

'you' ARE SO FAR FROM what IS ACTUALLY GOING ON here that even I am somewhat SURPRISED that people like 'you' were STILL existing, in the days when this was being written.

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

Why?

Fri Jul 21, 2023 9:06 am

WHY 'what'?

WHY do I, supposedly, have 'Beliefs'?

WHY do I, supposedly, have 'Beliefs', which I was, supposedly, 'unconscious' of before?

WHY do I, supposedly, 'Believe' in 'a beginning'?

Or, are you ASKING me WHY? in regards to some 'thing' ELSE?

If it is the latter, then WHY 'what', EXACTLY?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Wizard22 » Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am



Wizard22

Posts: 1584
Joined: Fri Jul 08, 2022 8:16 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

1. YES, there REALLY IS A BEGINNING.

2. WHERE THE BEGINNING IS, IS HERE.

3. WHEN THE BEGINNING IS, IS NOW.

ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL BE, and ALWAYS IS 'The BEGINNING' HERE, NOW.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:14 am

I disagree.

But see, Age, you are entitled to your beliefs. And I am entitled to mine. You should dwell on your beliefs, after denying you have beliefs at all previously. You're becoming self-conscious ever so slightly. I consider that an improvement, good job!

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:46 am



Age

Posts: 16527
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

“ Age wrote: ↑

1. YES, there REALLY IS A BEGINNING.

2. WHERE THE BEGINNING IS, IS HERE.

3. WHEN THE BEGINNING IS, IS NOW.

ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL BE, and ALWAYS IS 'The BEGINNING' HERE, NOW.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:14 am

I disagree.

BY ALL MEANS PLEASE DO.

BUT 'this' WAS BLATANTLY OBVIOUS, ALREADY.

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

But see, Age, you are entitled to your beliefs.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am

Okay. THANK 'you' FOR LETTING 'me' KNOW what 'I' AM ENTITLED TO here.

Which, by the way, I do NOT AGREE that 'you', human beings, are ENTITLED TO your OWN BELIEFS, like MOST, if NOT ALL, of 'you', adult human beings, have 'GROWN UP' to BELIEVE, IS TRUE.

AND, just like I can PROVE, IRREFUTABLY, what I SAID and CLAIMED PREVIOUSLY here I can ALSO PROVE, IRREFUTABLY, what I ALLUDED TO here, AS WELL. AND, just AS SIMPLY and AS EASILY.

That IS; FOR ANY one who is Truly INTERESTED.

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

And I am entitled to mine.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am

LOL So, 'you' BELIEVE that 'you' ARE ABSOLUTELY ENTITLED TO ANY and ALL OF 'your' BELIEFS, right?

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

You should dwell on your beliefs, after denying you have beliefs at all previously.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am

Did you WANT TO MAKE 'this' DISCUSSION ABOUT 'your' CLAIM, and BELIEF, that 'I' have BELIEFS here? Or, do you WANT TO MAKE 'this' DISCUSSION ABOUT 'your' CLAIM, and BELIEF, that there is NO 'beginning'?

Either way I AM HAPPY.

ALSO, what 'you' just WROTE here appears, well to me anyway, a Truly WEIRD and STUPID 'thing' to SAY.

WHY 'should' I 'dwell' on 'my beliefs', which you OBVIOUS BELIEVE ABSOLUTELY that I have? AND, HOW, EXACTLY, would or does one 'dwell' ON 'their beliefs'?

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

You're becoming self-conscious ever so slightly.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am

WHY?

I STILL DO NOT HAVE the 'Beliefs', which 'you' BELIEVE that I have.

“ Wizard22 wrote: ↑

I consider that an improvement, good job!

Fri Jul 21, 2023 10:18 am

LOL Even 'this' 'you' got ABSOLUTELY and TOTALLY Wrong AND Incorrect AS WELL.

Here we have A PRIME example of just HOW MUCH INFLUENCE BELIEFS HAD ON the people, back then.

This one here, LAUGHINGLY, ACTUALLY STARTED TO BELIEVE that I was, somehow, COMING TO SEE and RECOGNIZE I HAD A BELIEF, which I NEVER EVEN STARTED TO ASSUME I HAD, let alone SAW OR RECOGNIZED I HAD.

I KNOW the 'thoughts' WITHIN 'this body', AND there IS NOT A one, which BELIEVES what "wizard22" IS ASSUMING and BELIEVING here. Although "wizard22" is NOT ABLE TO SEE and RECOGNIZE 'this', at the moment, BECAUSE, ONCE AGAIN, 'it' IS BELIEVING some 'thing' otherwise.

Also, and by the way, "wizard22", is the ONLY response 'you' are going to COME BACK WITH, AFTER I SHOWED 'you' WHERE and WHEN 'the beginning' IS, EXACTLY, is; 'I disagree'?

I KNOW I SAID, that 'you' WOULD MISS and/or MISUNDERSTAND MY ANSWER, BUT I 'thought' that 'you' would, AT LEAST, 'try to' PROVE me WRONG here.

The BELIEFS, within that body, REALLY ARE AS STRONG as I SAID and CLAIMED, BEFORE, and REALLY DID BLOCK 'you' FROM being ABLE TO COMPREHEND and UNDERSTAND MY ANSWER as I SUGGESTED and CLAIM, AS WELL.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by daniel j lavender » Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am



“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Thu Jul 20, 2023 11:13 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

...While, ALSO, REVEALING that if you ACTUALLY KNEW what ALL 'things' were constitutionally made up of...

Thu Jul 20, 2023 10:14 am

All things are *all things*. They are not “made up of”. They would already be *all things*.

So, to you, ALL 'things' are made up of ALL 'things', right or wrong?

All things *are* all things.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Again, all things are all things. “All things” implicitly includes constituent parts. Suggesting all things are “made up of” is redundant.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

AGAIN, if you ALREADY KNEW what ALL 'things' were made up of, EXACTLY, then you would NOT be SAYING 'things' such as and like, 'All things are all things'.

Once again, “all things are made up of” is a fallacious statement.

“All things are all things” is not a fallacious statement.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

All things would not be “constitutionally made up of”, as you state, *as they would already be all things*.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

LOL EVERY 'thing' IS made up of at least two OTHER 'things', EXCEPT, OF COURSE, for the TWO FUNDAMENTAL 'things' of the Universe, Itself.

Then your statement “*every thing* is made up of at least two other things” is incorrect. The “two fundamental things of the universe” would *not* be made up of at least two other things.

Thus your earlier statement “what *all things* are constitutionally made up of” is further confirmed to be fallacious as well as your questions directed at me regarding the premise.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

You fallaciously suggest “all things” would be “made up of” additional things or other things or something else.

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

BUT what you call 'my fallacy' is ONLY what you ASSUME I am SAYING, and MEANING, here. However, what I am ACTUALLY ASKING, SAYING, and MEANING is DIFFERENT FROM what you ARE ASSUMING, and/or BELIEVING, here.

I will now suggest TO 'you' what I suggest TO "others", and that IS it is MUCH BETTER if you SEEK OUT, GAIN, and OBTAIN ACTUAL CLARITY, FIRST, BEFORE you ASSUME absolutely ANY 'thing' here.

Refrain from using sloppy language and undefined terms and clarification wouldn't be necessary.



daniel j lavender

Posts: 129
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact: [💬](#)

Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am
Well you have YET to INFORM the 'readers' here 'what' 'immaterial expanse', CONSISTS OF, CONSTITUTIONALLY MADE UP OF, is COMPOSED OF, or IS 'what', (in relation to ANY other 'terms' or 'words' that you would like to ADD IN here).

I have:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Sat Jul 01, 2023 7:23 am
Immaterial expanse consists of immaterial expanse. As stated, immaterial expanse is simply immaterial expanse.

Do 'you' KNOW what 'you' sound like here "daniel j lavender"?

If no, then, to me, you sound JUST LIKE the "preacher" who CLAIMS, 'God created the Universe/everything', but WHEN QUESTIONED, 'But who created God?', and the reply comes back something like; 'It just is what it is', and/or, 'There are somethings that we are just NOT meant TO KNOW'.

So, in other words, what you are essentially SAYING here is like, 'God created the Universe, because God is God and God can create anything. God created the Universe, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known'.

Or, as you ARE SAYING here, 'existence consists of an immaterial expanse, because existence could NOT exist without an immaterial expanse and existence is all things. Immaterial expanse is an immaterial expanse, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known here.

The CIRCULAR REASONING, with both, IS THE SAME.
The INCONSISTENCIES, within both, are more or less THE SAME. AND,
The CONTRADICTION, itself, IS more or less THE SAME.

Not at all.

I described immaterial expanse, I explained what it is. Properties, qualities were identified. The measurability of immaterial expanse was explained. All of this has been discussed on previous pages. Questions were answered, details were not evaded: viewtopic.php?p=653291#p653291

Furthermore one could say the *exact same* of you and your position. And it would actually apply.

You suggest the "two fundamental things of the universe" are not comprised of constituent parts. Why not? Because they are "fundamental"? Why are you unable to explain further? Is that "just the way it is"?

You're basically saying:

Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am
The universe consists of two fundamental things, because the universe could NOT exist without two fundamental things. Fundamental things are fundamental things and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known here.

The CIRCULAR REASONING, with both, IS THE SAME.

Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Immaterial expanse is about as basic as it gets, as stated here:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Wed Jun 28, 2023 8:59 am
Immaterial expanse is about as simple, is about as basic as it gets, hence the trouble simplifying or breaking it down further.

Okay. Now, let us LOOK AT 'this' FROM ANOTHER perspective, or IN ANOTHER way.

Existence consists of 'things' and of NO 'things' BECAUSE 'this' is about as simple, and is about as basic as 'it' gets, hence the, IMAGINED, BELIEVED, and self-PROCLAIMED, 'trouble' simplifying or breaking 'it' down further.

If there are things how can there be no things?

There can't be. Something and nothing cannot coexist.

That expressed is not simplified knowledge. It is convoluted nonsense.

Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
Stars are bright. Icicles are cold. The automobile is aerodynamic. Nothing or nonexistence, beyond the concept or term, has no properties or qualities as it does not actually exist.

SO, and LAUGHINGLY, ONCE AGAIN, you CLAIM that 'nothing' IS A 'thing', EXISTS, and IS A PART OF 'existence', itself, BUT that 'nothing', or 'nonexistence' does NOT ACTUALLY EXIST.

"Nothing" is a word, a term, a concept and is part of existence.

"Nothing" is a thing, not no thing. Hence a contradictory concept and term.

"Nothing", "nonexistence" and "nothingness" are all words, terms, concepts. Those exist.

Nothing in and of itself, nonexistence in and of itself, nothingness in and of itself *does not exist*.

The words, the concepts are not nothing itself, not nothingness itself nor nonexistence itself.

There are only things. There is only existence.

Age wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am
Expanse can be measured arbitrarily from one point to another. In the hypothetical case of a single physical object or most-distant object expanse can be measured from that point beyond and considered to be indefinite from that point.

Nothingness, nonexistence, nothing has no extent or capacity to be measured.

So, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'nothingness' IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY TO EXIST, right?

“Area of nothingness” is an oxymoron.

If it is an area it is *not* nothing. The area may be considered empty (as in free of matter) however it would *not* be nothingness.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Either way, BUT, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' NOT just CAN exist but ACTUALLY DOES EXIST, right?

Even if, and this is for sake of argument, immaterial expanse did not actually exist out in the environment immaterial expanse would still be a thing, it would still be a concept and would not resultantly create some gap of nonexistence. The environment, regions of existence would still be completely filled with things whether matter, energy, etcetera.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Either way, AND, you BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', BUT, 'an area' of 'nothing' can NOT BE A 'thing', right?

As expressed above “area of nothing” is an oxymoron.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Here we have ANOTHER GREAT example of when one is currently BELIEVING SOME 'thing' IS TRUE, then 'they' are NOT ABLE TO SEE the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'. 'This phenomena' can be CLEARLY SEEN by THE WAY 'this one' PRESENTS 'its' ASSUMPTIONS and BELIEFS here. That is; even when an IRREFUTABLE INCONSISTENCY or CONTRADICTION in what they are SAYING, and CLAIMING, based off of their OWN ASSUMPTION or BELIEF, is ABSOLUTELY BLINDINGLY OBVIOUS TO "others", 'that one' REMAINS COMPLETELY OBLIVIOUS TO the FALLACIES in what 'it' IS SAYING, and CLAIMING, as well as to the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'.

OF COURSE 'you' ONLY SEE 'congruence' here. This IS BECAUSE you have DEFINED 'words' and 'terms' IN A WAY that FIT IN WITH what you HAD ALREADY CONCLUDED, and are now CURRENTLY BELIEVING, IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE here.

you have MADE UP and CREATED these Truly INCONSISTENT, CONTRADICTIONARY, and INCONGRUENT DEFINITIONS FOR 'words' and 'terms' here BECAUSE you HAD ALREADY a PREEXISTING BELIEF that 'nothing' and 'something' DO NOT EXIST and COULD NOT EVER EXIST.

BUT, TO OVERCOME this Truly CONTRADICTIONARY and False CLAIM, you MADE UP the 'concept' that 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', and EXISTS, BUT WHILE NEVER BEING ABLE TO EXPLAIN what 'immaterial expanse' is ACTUALLY MADE UP OF 'itself'.

BECAUSE IF you EVER DID, then the CONTRADICTION WOULD BE here for ALL OF 'us' TO LOOK AT and SEE.

SO, you WILL just CONTINUE ON the WAY you HAVE BEEN and ARE here now. BECAUSE to do OTHERWISE would, LITERALLY, BE the DEATH or END of 'you'.

(BUT because 'you' do NOT YET KNOW and UNDERSTAND WHO and WHAT the 'you' IS, EXACTLY, what I just SAID here WOULD BE and IS BEING LOST ON just about ALL of the 'human beings', BACK in the days when this was being written.)

I usually read these in the film narrator voice.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

SO, ONCE AGAIN, we find 'ourselves' with even FURTHER PROOF that, ACTUALLY, WITHOUT 'nothing' there IS NO 'Existence', well NOT in the WAY 'Existence' EXISTS NOW, HERE, anyway.

The more accurate statement would be “With existence is without nothing, without nothing is with existence”.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'.

Why must that be the case?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Eodnhøj7 » Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm



Eodnhøj7

Posts: 8560

Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 15, 2023 12:17 am

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 14, 2023 8:18 pm

1. And this sum of all things is without comparison for if there where comparison it would not be the sum of all things. Without comparison there is no contrast and without contrast we cannot have definition, i.e. thingness

What do you mean “cannot have definition, i.e. thingness”?

The totality itself may be without comparison but it still concerns things, it is all things.

Existence is all things, existence is all definition.

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 14, 2023 8:18 pm

thus the sum of all things is the same as nothing and is the same as saying nothing.

The sum of all things is not the same as nothing.

The sum of all things is the sum of all things.

The sum of all things *includes* or *encompasses* the concept nothing. That which is encompassed is overshadowed. That which is overshadowed is not equal. Nothing is not equal to the sum of all things. Nothing is not the same as the sum of all things.

The sum of all things concerns things, not no thing.

“Thingness” is an intrinsic aspect of existence, entirety or part. The entirety or whole can't be without parts, without things. The entirety or whole necessitates parts, the entirety or whole necessitates things. It is that difference of things which balances as simply being. Thingness is implicitly acknowledged in the balance of being.

As defined in the essay nothing, nothingness and nonexistence are synonyms. They are nonbeing, no thing.

Our definitions are different so we will fundamentally disagree on basis of definition.

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑
5. Nothingness is not an abstraction for to have the abstraction of nothingness there would be no abstraction at all.

Fri Jul 14, 2023 8:18 pm

Precisely the point.

That the abstraction nothingness is illustrates the point of existence.

It's a contradictory abstraction. A contradictory concept.

An illuminating incongruence.

It is. Itself illustrating how nothingness, how nonexistence cannot be.

There is no evidence of nothingness, of nonexistence. No one has provided, no one can provide evidence of nothingness or of nonexistence. Nothingness is not an abstraction. Nothingness is not here. Nothingness is not there. Nothingness does not appear to be anywhere yet *that* is the very premise used to declare nothingness is. To the contrary. *That* is the very premise to declare existence is, that existence is *all* that is.

For the record the only major detail we are disagreeing with is "no-thingness/nothingness"...

1. Boundaries. A thing is that which has boundaries (or definition if you prefer that word).
2. To say "the sum of all thing is the sum of all things" is to make a statement of equality and equality requires two or more things to occur. This multiplicity necessitates a difference in time/space otherwise they would be one. There cannot be multiple "sum of all things", as necessitated by making a statement of equality, other wise there would be something beyond one sum (i.e. the other sum). But this point can be ignored. This point cannot:

The sum of all things is one thing and this one thing has no comparison, as it is the 'sum of all things' and cannot have anything beyond it, therefore 'the sum of all things' is an empty statement as it is formless because it is absnt of comparison.

Another point: the fact that there are parts which work together, to form the whole, necessitates all the parts working as one and as 'working as one' makes any differentiation of one part from another completely an artificial construct that is illusionary in nature. To observe a thing is to observe a relative truth and as relative results in contradiction as it is simultaneous true and false under the totality of contexts it exists through. In other terms "thingness" is an illusion.

3. There is no separation between nothingness and being as nothingness has no distinctions within it to separate it from being.

4. "Existence is" is an empty statement that has no definite meaning. The point that existence is infinite makes existence indefinite and as indefinite is formless, as formless it is no-thing.

Last edited by Eodnhøj7 on Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:32 pm, edited 1 time in total.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Eodnhøj7 » Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:28 pm



Eodnhøj7

Posts: 8560
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

“ Age wrote: ↑
Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:19 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

“ Age wrote: ↑
Mon Jul 17, 2023 1:07 am

It is ONLY 'you' here who says 'this', "daniel j lavender". AND, you HAVE TO SAY 'this' to keep 'it' aligned WITH what you currently BELIEVE is ABSOLUTELY true.

That existence is formless and infinite?

Not quite.

Eodnhøj7 seems to agree:

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑
Wed Jul 05, 2023 3:23 pm

1. Agreed. To put it in other terms: the totality is without compare, otherwise it would not be the totality as something would be beyond it. Without comparison it is without form as form requires comparison. **This formless nature...**

BUT "eodnhøj7" WILL CONTRADICT "its" OWN 'self' later on here, BECAUSE 'it' BELIEVES that ABSOLUTELY EVERY 'thing' IS A CONTRADICTION anyway, and so if 'it' does NOT CONTRADICT "its" OWN 'self', then NOT EVERY 'thing' IS A CONTRADICTION, OBVIOUSLY.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑
Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

You agree that existence, or "the universe", is infinite:

“ Age wrote: ↑
Mon Jul 17, 2023 12:58 am
'The', or ANY, '1-dimensional circle' is in concept alone or is created by human beings alone. So, REALLY has absolutely NOTHING AT ALL to do with the INFINITE and ETERNAL Universe, Itself.

Here you agree again:

“ Age wrote: ↑
Mon Jul 17, 2023 1:16 am
And this is JUST BECAUSE the Universe IS 'infinite' AND 'eternal'. The Universe, contrary to some BELIEF is NOT 'circular in nature'.

Here are others discussing and agreeing with the formlessness of existence, including reference to Leibniz and his views of the formlessness of existence:

“ Obvious Leo wrote: ↑
Mon Dec 28, 2015 7:44 pm
Surely if there is such a thing as an objective reality it is formless and purely informational in its nature...

“ Obvious Leo wrote: ↑
Mon Dec 28, 2015 10:09 pm

The idea originally comes from Leibniz, who was arguably the world first true information theorist.

Apparently I'm not in such bad company.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 1:07 am

And you are CLAIMING that there IS 'existence' BECAUSE of 'things', which ARE distinguishable.

THUS, there IS 'form'. BUT, BECAUSE you have to 'TRY TO' make words here FIT IN WITH your BELIEF ABOUT 'existence being infinite' you HAVE TO ALSO CLAIM that 'existence' IS FORMLESS. you ARE CLAIMING the 'existence' IS FORMLESS

Existence is both part and whole. Refer to the Existence Both Part And Whole section beneath Additional Notes of the original text.

Particular things have form, they are limited to some specific shape. Existence as the entirety, existence generally speaking is formless. This should be clear from discussion on the previous pages.

Atla is claiming existence as the entirety, existence generally speaking has some circular form or some specific shape, which concerns boundaries or borders, while claiming it is *without* boundary or border.

ONCE AGAIN, you have completely and utterly DETRACTED FROM the POINT that I was ALLUDING TO, BECAUSE you did NOT SEEK OUT CLARIFICATION FIRST.

you, ONCE AGAIN, ASSUMED some 'thing', JUMPED TO SOME CONCLUSION, and then proceeded FROM there.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 1:07 am

while CLAIMING that 'existence' exists BECAUSE of FORMED 'things'.

Unless, OF COURSE, you WILL SHOW us otherwise.

Not claiming this at all.

Existence does not “exist because of formed things”.

Existence is eternal. Existence does not exist “because of”.

So, HOW does one KNOW 'existence is eternal' IF 'existence' is NOT 'because of' SOME 'thing'?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

To imply “because”, to imply “cause” or “reason” for existence would be to assume some existing prior to existence.

Well, OBVIOUSLY, 'existence' would HAVE TO BE made up OF some 'thing' to be ABLE TO exist, IN THE BEGINNING.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

The premise is nonsensical.

BUT, YOUR premise that 'existence' exists BECAUSE OF 'things', and does NOT exist BECAUSE OF 'nothing' IS NOT nonsensical, TO you, right?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

Existence does not exist “because of”. Existence is eternal. Existence just is.

So, WHY GO ON about 'things' ARE NEEDED for 'existence', and that there IS NOT 'no things'?

If 'existence' does NOT exist 'because of' 'things', then 'existence' could exist 'because of' NO 'things'. Or, does 'this' then BECOME nonsensical?

If I say everything is a contradiction and I contradict myself (as everything is a contradiction) then is it really a contradiction?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by daniel j lavender » Sat Jul 22, 2023 2:10 am



daniel j lavender

Posts: 129

Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm

Location: Tennessee

Contact: [💬](#)

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

For the record the only major detail we are disagreeing with is “no-thingness/nothingness”...

1. Boundaries. A thing is that which has boundaries (or definition if you prefer that word).

2. To say “the sum of all thing is the sum of all things” is to make a statement of equality and equality requires two or more things to occur. This multiplicity necessitates a difference in time/space otherwise they would be one. There cannot be multiple “sum of all things”, as necessitated by making a statement of equality, other wise there would be something beyond one sum (i.e. the other sum). But this point can be ignored. This point cannot:

The sum of all things is one thing and this one thing has no comparison, as it is the 'sum of all things' and cannot have anything beyond it, therefore “the sum of all things” is an empty statement as it is formless because it is absent of comparison.

Another point: the fact that there are parts which work together, to form the whole, necessitates all the parts working as one and as 'working as one' makes any differentiation of one part from another completely an artificial construct that is illusionary in nature. To observe a thing is to observe a relative truth and as relative results in contradiction as it is simultaneous true and false under the totality of contexts it exists through. In other terms “thingness” is an illusion.

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

For the record the only major detail we are disagreeing with is “no-thingness/nothingness”...

Yes.

It appears you are equating nothingness with whole/no parts.

I am equating nothingness with no existence.

As stated our definitions are different so we will fundamentally disagree on basis of definition.

Or at least *appear* to disagree on basis of definition.

Two parties could be conveying the same logical idea but if their terms and definitions do not coincide they will appear completely at odds often to the point of absurdity. That seems applicable in this situation.

Personally I wouldn't use the term “nothingness” to indicate wholeness just as I wouldn't use the term “area of nothingness” to indicate immaterial expanse.

I would use “wholeness” to indicate wholeness and “immaterial expanse” to indicate immaterial expanse.

This is how subjects become confused and terms and ideas misconstrued. Thus why it is crucial to have direct, structured terms and premises.

That said I will continue to approach your statements with the terms defined in the original text.

“Eodnhoj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

3. There is no separation between nothingness and being as nothingness has no distinctions within it to separate it from being.

There is seemingly no separation between nothingness and being because nothingness is not there.

All that is being so the idea of nothingness must be fashioned in its image.

If there was nothingness we would not be having this conversation.

Nothingness, for a lack of a better phrase, must be fashioned to the coattails of existence because all there *is* existence.

One must try to mix, one must try to blend nothingness in with existence to make nothingness seem real or actual. Nothingness is not.

“Eodnhoj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

4. “Existence is” is an empty statement that has no definite meaning. The point that existence is infinite makes existence indefinite and as indefinite is formless

“Existence is” is a universal statement.

Thus;

“Existence is” *is* an empty statement.

“Existence is” is a *complete* statement.

“Existence is” is a *specific* statement.

“Existence is” is a *general* statement.

Existence is green. Existence is purple. Existence is blue. Existence is windy. Existence is humid.

The terms are all interchangeable, the statement virtually of complete versatility as existence *is* all and all *is* existence:

The leaf is green. The tie is purple. The sky is blue. Chicago is windy. The weather is humid.

The terms interchanged once more:

The leaf is existence. The tie is existence. The sky is existence. Chicago is existence. Weather is existence.

All phrases work, all connotation correct and congruent as existence *is* all, existence *is* each and every thing. Whatever it is, it *is* existence. Existence is.

As stated “existence is” is a universal statement, a universal premise. “Existence is” is the ultimate statement of ultimate versatility. “Existence is” *does* have definite meaning and definite connotation but it also has indefinite meaning and indefinite connotation. Existence is infinite, existence is unlimited. Existence concerns both definite and indefinite.

“Eodnhoj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

...as formless it is no-thing.

As expressed existence is omnifarious, existence is of *all forms* not *no form*.

Existence is formless in that sense as discussed here: viewtopic.php?p=652950#p652950

In other words existence would be formless in the sense of *all-things*, not formless in the sense of *no-thing*.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Sat Jul 22, 2023 12:14 pm



Age

Posts: 16527

Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

“Eodnhoj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:28 pm

“Age wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:19 am

“daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

That existence is formless and infinite?

Not quite.

Eodnhoj7 seems to agree:

BUT “eodnhoj7” WILL CONTRADICT “its” OWN ‘self’ later on here, BECAUSE ‘it’ BELIEVES that ABSOLUTELY EVERY ‘thing’ IS A CONTRADICTION anyway, and so if ‘it’ does NOT CONTRADICT “its” OWN ‘self’, then NOT EVERY ‘thing’ IS A CONTRADICTION, OBVIOUSLY.

“daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

You agree that existence, or “the universe”, is infinite:

Here you agree again:

Here are others discussing and agreeing with the formlessness of existence, including reference to Leibniz and his views of the formlessness of existence:

Apparently I’m not in such bad company.

Existence is both part and whole. Refer to the Existence Both Part And Whole section beneath Additional Notes of the original text.

Particular things have form, they are limited to some specific shape. Existence as the entirety, existence generally speaking is formless. This should be clear from discussion on the previous pages.

Atla is claiming existence as the entirety, existence generally speaking has some circular form or some specific shape, which concerns boundaries or borders, while claiming it is *without* boundary or border.

ONCE AGAIN, you have completely and utterly DETRACTED FROM the POINT that I was ALLUDING TO, BECAUSE you did NOT SEEK OUT CLARIFICATION FIRST.

you, ONCE AGAIN, ASSUMED some 'thing', JUMPED TO SOME CONCLUSION, and then proceeded FROM there.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

Not claiming this at all.

Existence does not “exist because of formed things”.

Existence is eternal. Existence does not exist “because of”.

So, HOW does one KNOW 'existence is eternal' IF 'existence' is NOT 'because of' SOME 'thing'?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

To imply “because”, to imply “cause” or “reason” for existence would be to assume some existing prior to existence.

Well, OBVIOUSLY, 'existence' would HAVE TO BE made up OF some 'thing' to be ABLE TO exist, IN THE BEGINNING.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

The premise is nonsensical.

BUT, YOUR premise that 'existence' exists BECAUSE OF 'things', and does NOT exist BECAUSE OF 'nothing' IS NOT nonsensical, TO you, right?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 17, 2023 2:01 am

Existence does not exist “because of”. Existence is eternal. Existence just is.

So, WHY GO ON about 'things' ARE NEEDED for 'existence', and that there IS NOT 'no things'?

If 'existence' does NOT exist 'because of' 'things', then 'existence' could exist 'because of' NO 'things'. Or, does 'this' then BECOME nonsensical?

If I say everything is a contradiction and I contradict myself (as everything is a contradiction) then is it really a contradiction?

But Everything is NOT a contradiction.

And, if 'it' REALLY is a contradiction or not, then ONLY 'you' would KNOW "eodhnoj7".

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Sat Jul 22, 2023 12:38 pm



Age
Posts: 16527
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Thu Jul 20, 2023 11:13 am

All things are *all things*. They are not “made up of”. They would already be *all things*.

So, to you, ALL 'things' are made up of ALL 'things', right or wrong?

All things are all things.

AND,

God IS God.
People ARE people.
Clouds ARE clouds. And,
Insanity IS insanity.

Now, that 'that' IS ALL CLEARED UP and ELABORATED UPON, the BEST 'you' CAN DO, looks like we are AT the 'end of YOUR story', and CLAIM, here.

That is; 'existence IS existence' SOLELY BECAUSE 'it IS'.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

Again, all things are all things. “All things” implicitly includes constituent parts. Suggesting all things are “made up of” is redundant.

AGAIN, if you ALREADY KNEW what ALL 'things' were made up of, EXACTLY, then you would NOT be SAYING 'things' such as and like, 'All things are all things'.

Once again, “all things are made up of” is a fallacious statement.

But 'that statement' IS NOT FINISHED. So, HOW do you KNOW 'it' IS a so-called 'fallacious statement'?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“All things are all things” is not a fallacious statement.

It may NOT be. BUT, 'it' IS a Truly STUPID, FOOLISH, IDIOTIC, and just down right a Truly RIDICULOUS and LUDICROUS 'thing' to SAY and STATE, especially IN a philosophy forum when and where one has come to CLAIM some 'thing' is ABSOLUTELY TRUE, RIGHT, AND CORRECT, and the ONLY 'thing' 'they' END UP SAYING and STATING some like you HAVE here.

ONCE MORE, you are sounding the "preacher" who SAYS and STATES, 'God created everything, BECAUSE God IS God'.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

All things would not be “constitutionally made up of”, as you state, *as they would already be all things*.

LOL EVERY 'thing' IS made up of at least two OTHER 'things', EXCEPT, OF COURSE, for the TWO FUNDAMENTAL 'things' of the Universe, Itself.

Then your statement “*every thing* is made up of at least two other things” is incorrect.

LOL
LOL
LOL

BUT I HAVE NEVER FINISHED a statement 'THAT WAY'.

COPYING ONLY A PART of someone "else's" statement, and then CLAIMING that 'that part' ONLY IS incorrect is ABSOLUTELY DECEITFUL.

But do NOT let 'that' STOP you from 'trying to' be DECEITFUL, AGAIN.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

The “two fundamental things of the universe” would *not* be made up of at least two other things.

WHY would you and WHY did you SAY and WRITE this here now?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

Thus your earlier statement “what *all things* are constitutionally made up of” is further confirmed to be fallacious as well as your questions directed at me regarding the premise.

LOL
LOL
LOL

you are GOING INSANE here.

What those TWO FUNDAMENTAL 'things' of the Universe ARE made up of IS DIFFERENT FROM what EVERY 'thing' ELSE IS made up of.

WHEN, and IF, you EVER do LEARN and COME-TO-KNOW what 'things' ARE made up of, EXACTLY, THEN you WILL UNDERSTAND what I have been SAYING and POINTING OUT here.

you WILL ALSO KNOW HOW, and WHY, the Universe WORKS the WAY 'It' does, AS WELL AS MORE ABOUT 'Existence', Itself, ALSO.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

You fallaciously suggest “all things” would be “made up of” additional things or other things or something else.

BUT what you call 'my fallacy' is ONLY what you ASSUME I am SAYING, and MEANING, here. However, what I am ACTUALLY ASKING, SAYING, and MEANING is DIFFERENT FROM what you ARE ASSUMING, and/or BELIEVING, here.

I will now suggest TO 'you' what I suggest TO "others", and that IS it is MUCH BETTER if you SEEK OUT, GAIN, and OBTAIN ACTUAL CLARITY, FIRST, BEFORE you ASSUME absolutely ANY 'thing' here.

Refrain from using sloppy language and undefined terms and clarification wouldn't be necessary.

LOL
LOL
LOL

AND as I have ALREADY SHOWN, and PROVEN here, when 'people' like you ARE QUESTIONED and CHALLENGED OVER and ABOUT your CLAIMS, then 'what' COMES-TO-LIGHT is that ACTUALLY you do NOT even KNOW what you ARE TALKING ABOUT.

SEE, IF, and WHEN, you LEARN what the True, Right, AND Correct DEFINITIONS and TERMS ARE, EXACTLY, then you WILL START TO BEGIN to USE the Right WORDS, as you WILL KNOW WHAT WORDS FIT IN PERFECTLY, TOGETHER, to FORM a PERFECT, CRYSTAL CLEAR, Picture OF ALL-THERE-IS.

BUT, what you ARE SHOWING and PROVING here is that you ARE A LONG WAY OFF LEARNING what 'this' ENTAILS, EXACTLY.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 3:23 am

I have:

Do 'you' KNOW what 'you' sound like here "daniel j lavender"?

If no, then, to me, you sound JUST LIKE the "preacher" who CLAIMS, 'God created the Universe/everything', but WHEN QUESTIONED, 'But who created God?', and the reply comes back something like; 'It just is what it is', and/or, 'There are somethings that we are just NOT meant TO KNOW'.

So, in other words, what you are essentially SAYING here is like, 'God created the Universe, because God is God and God can create anything. God created the Universe, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known'.

Or, as you ARE SAYING here, 'existence consists of an immaterial expanse, because existence could NOT exist without an immaterial expanse and existence is all things. Immaterial expanse is an immaterial expanse, and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known here.

The CIRCULAR REASONING, with both, IS THE SAME.
The INCONSISTENCIES, within both, are more or less THE SAME. AND,
The CONTRADICTION, itself, IS more or less THE SAME.

Not at all.

I described immaterial expanse, I explained what it is. Properties, qualities were identified. The measurability of immaterial expanse was explained.

But, the 'measurability' OF 'what', EXACTLY, you have NOT YET EXPLAINED.

And, you WILL NOT BECAUSE IF you DID, then you would REFUTE your OTHER CLAIM here.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

All of this has been discussed on previous pages. Questions were answered, details were not evaded: viewtopic.php?p=653291#p653291

Furthermore one could say the *exact same* of you and your position. And it would actually apply.

You suggest the “two fundamental things of the universe” are not comprised of constituent parts. Why not? Because they are “fundamental”? Why are you unable to explain further? Is that “just the way it is”?

LOL
LOL
LOL

NO one, and I WILL REPEAT NO one had ASKED me A SINGULAR CLARIFYING QUESTION regarding what I SAID above here.

ONCE AGAIN, you have DRIFTED OFF on SOME IMAGINED SCENARIO.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

You're basically saying:

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

The universe consists of two fundamental things, because the universe could NOT exist without two fundamental things. Fundamental things are fundamental things and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known here.

The CIRCULAR REASONING, with both, IS THE SAME.

LOL
LOL
LOL

I have NEVER even thought, let alone EVER suggest, thus NEVER even SAID NOR WROTE ABSOLUTELY ANY 'thing' like 'this' here.

ONCE AGAIN, you have ALLOWED your OWN MADE UP ASSUMPTIONS to GET the BETTER OF 'you', and HAVE DRIFTED OFF, AGAIN, on some TANGENT OF your OWN MAKING.

So, ONCE AGAIN, I WILL REPEAT it will be BETTER FOR you TO SEEK OUT and OBTAIN ACTUAL CLARITY BEFORE you BEGIN to START ASSUMING 'these' Truly RIDICULOUSLY STUPID CLAIMS, which ARE OF your OWN IMAGINATION, and WORSE STILL ARE now OF your OWN BELIEFS and BELIEVING.

ALSO, I WILL NOTE, AGAIN, that YOUR VERY DECEITFUL WAYS here are BEING NOTICED. So, PLEASE REFRAIN FROM attributing 'things' that I HAVE NEVER SAID, NOR have even 'thought' AND QUOTING 'them' as though I SAID 'it'.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Okay. Now, let us LOOK AT 'this' FROM ANOTHER perspective, or IN ANOTHER way.

Existence consists of 'things' and of NO 'things' BECAUSE 'this' is about as simple, and is about as basic as 'it' gets, hence the, IMAGINED, BELIEVED, and self-PROCLAIMED, 'trouble' simplifying or breaking 'it' down further.

If there are things how can there be no things?

WHEN you STOP BELIEVING 'that', which you ARE here. THEN, and ONLY THEN, WILL you COME-TO-UNDERSTAND.

UNTIL THEN I WILL LEAVE 'you' WITH 'your' BELIEF/S here.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

There can't be. Something and nothing cannot coexist.

LOL
LOL
LOL

'We' KNOW that 'this' is what you currently BELIEVE IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE. 'you' have TOLD 'us' 'this' TOO MANY TIMES now "daniel j lavender".

HOWEVER, what 'you' BELIEVE IS TRUE is NOT necessarily true AT ALL. BUT, you can NOT SEE NOR COMPREHEND this IRREFUTABLE Fact, AGAIN BECAUSE of what 'you' BELIEVE IS TRUE here.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

That expressed is not simplified knowledge. It is convoluted nonsense.

Are 'you' even AWARE 'you' ARE PROVING, IRREFUTABLY, what I have been SAYING and CLAIMING here?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

SO, and LAUGHINGLY, ONCE AGAIN, you CLAIM that 'nothing' IS A 'thing', EXISTS, and IS A PART OF 'existence', itself, BUT that 'nothing', or 'nonexistence' does NOT ACTUALLY EXIST.

“Nothing” is a word, a term, a concept and is part of existence.

“Nothing” is a thing, not no thing. Hence a contradictory concept and term.

“Nothing”, “nonexistence” and “nothingness” are all words, terms, concepts. Those exist.

Nothing in and of itself, nonexistence in and of itself, nothingness in and of itself *does not exist*.

The words, the concepts are not nothing itself, not nothingness itself nor nonexistence itself.

There are only things. There is only existence.

'you' ARE MISSING what 'I' AM SAYING and POINTING OUT, but WHY IS OBVIOUS.

AND, 'you' WILL JUST CONTINUE TO DO SO here, ANYWAY. That is; if you DO NOT CHANGE what you ARE DOING here.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

So, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'nothingness' IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY TO EXIST, right?

“Area of nothingness” is an oxymoron.

LOL
LOL
LOL

But 'you' can measure an area of NO material.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

If it is an area it is *not* nothing.

WHO EVER SAID or CLAIMED that 'an area' was NOTHING?

Do you even KNOW WHY you ASSUME these MOST IDIOTIC and STUPID 'things' here?

If no, the ANSWER IS Truly SIMPLE, and EASY, to WORK OUT, and thus KNOW, AS WELL.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

The area may be considered empty (as in free of matter) however it would *not* be nothingness.

SO, what would an 'area' completely empty of matter be considered, EXACTLY?

AND, do you YET KNOW WHY you KEEP CONTINUALLY go BACK TO 'nothingness' or 'nothing'?

you KEEP SAYING 'things' that NO one here is even IMAGINING, let alone, SUGGESTING, let alone SAYING and CLAIMING.

So, you KEEP going BACK TO your OWN IMAGINED and ASSUMED scenarios.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Either way, BUT, you STILL BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' NOT just CAN exist but ACTUALLY DOES EXIST, right?

Even if, and this is for sake of argument, immaterial expanse did not actually exist out in the environment immaterial expanse would still be a thing, it would still be a concept and would not resultantly create some gap of nonexistence.

ONCE MORE, absolutely NO one here is even 'thinking' ANY 'thing' like 'this', let alone SUGGESTING NOR SAYING ANY 'thing' like 'this'. This' ASSUMED SCENARIO EXISTS in 'that head' ALONE, and ONLY.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

The environment, regions of existence would still be completely filled with things whether matter, energy, etcetera.

It IS these types of Truly ILLOGICAL and FOOLISH CLAIMS WHY you can NOT YET SEE and UNDERSTAND the CONTRADICTIONS, which you are CONTINUALLY PUTTING OUT here.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Either way, AND, you BELIEVE that 'an area' of 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', BUT, 'an area' of 'nothing' can NOT BE A 'thing', right?

As expressed above “area of nothing” is an oxymoron.

TO 'you', ALONE, and ONLY BECAUSE OF 'your' currently HELD ONTO and VERY STRONGLY MAINTAINED BELIEFS, OF YOURS here.

WHEN, and IF, you EVER FIGURE 'this' OUT and thus DO get to Truly UNDERSTAND 'this' IRREFUTABLE Fact, then, JUST MAYBE, you WILL CHANGE.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

Here we have ANOTHER GREAT example of when one is currently BELIEVING SOME 'thing' IS TRUE, then 'they' are NOT ABLE TO SEE the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'. 'This phenomena' can be CLEARLY SEEN by THE WAY 'this one' PRESENTS 'its' ASSUMPTIONS and BELIEFS here. That is; even when an IRREFUTABLE INCONSISTENCY or CONTRADICTION in what they are SAYING, and CLAIMING, based off of their OWN ASSUMPTION or BELIEF, is ABSOLUTELY BLINDLY OBVIOUS TO "others", 'that one' REMAINS COMPLETELY OBLIVIOUS TO the FALLACIES in what 'it' IS SAYING, and CLAIMING, as well as to the ACTUAL Truth of 'things'.

OF COURSE 'you' ONLY SEE 'congruence' here. This IS BECAUSE you have DEFINED 'words' and 'terms' IN A WAY that FIT IN WITH what you HAD ALREADY CONCLUDED, and are now CURRENTLY BELIEVING, IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE here.

you have MADE UP and CREATED these Truly INCONSISTENT, CONTRADICTORY, and INCONGRUENT DEFINITIONS FOR 'words' and 'terms' here BECAUSE you HAD ALREADY a PREEXISTING BELIEF that 'nothing' and 'something' DO NOT EXIST and COULD NOT EVER EXIST.

BUT, TO OVERCOME this Truly CONTRADICTORY and False CLAIM, you MADE UP the 'concept' that 'immaterial expanse' IS A 'thing', and EXISTS, BUT WHILE NEVER BEING ABLE TO EXPLAIN what 'immaterial expanse' is ACTUALLY MADE UP OF 'itself'.

BECAUSE IF you EVER DID, then the CONTRADICTION WOULD BE here for ALL OF 'us' TO LOOK AT and SEE.

SO, you WILL just CONTINUE ON the WAY you HAVE BEEN and ARE here now. BECAUSE to do OTHERWISE would, LITERALLY, BE the DEATH or END of 'you'.

(BUT because 'you' do NOT YET KNOW and UNDERSTAND WHO and WHAT the 'you' IS, EXACTLY, what I just SAID here WOULD BE and IS BEING LOST ON just about ALL of the 'human beings', BACK in the days when this was being written.)

I usually read these in the film narrator voice.

DO whatever 'you' like "daniel j lavender". What 'I' SAID and WROTE here WAS and STILL IS FOR A VERY SPECIFIC PURPOSE, and AUDIENCE.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

SO, ONCE AGAIN, we find 'ourselves' with even FURTHER PROOF that, **ACTUALLY, WITHOUT** 'nothing' there **IS NO** 'Existence', well NOT in the WAY 'Existence' EXISTS NOW, HERE, anyway.

The more accurate statement would be “With existence is without nothing, without nothing is with existence”.

ONCE AGAIN, 'this statement and CLAIM' here could NOT be MORE False, MORE Wrong, MORE Inaccurate, AND MORE Incorrect.

But, PLEASE CONTINUE TO BELIEVE otherwise.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 1:26 am

The areas, or expanses, of 'nothing' which DOES, and HAS TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST in the way that It DOES, infinitely AND eternally, IS ALSO A 'thing'.

Why must that be the case?

WHY MUST 'what' be the case?

The part ABOUT 'areas or expanses of nothing'?

The part ABOUT 'areas or expanses of nothing' HAVING TO EXIST?

The part ABOUT 'areas or expanses of nothing' HAVING TO EXIST, for the Universe TO EXIST, the WAY that 'It' does?

The part ABOUT the 'areas or expanses of nothing' ALSO being A 'thing'? Or,

Some 'thing' else?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Sat Jul 22, 2023 1:39 pm



Age
Posts: 16527
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 22, 2023 2:10 am

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

For the record the only major detail we are disagreeing with is "no-thingness/nothingness"...

1. Boundaries. A thing is that which has boundaries (or definition if you prefer that word).
2. To say "the sum of all thing is the sum of all things" is to make a statement of equality and equality requires two or more things to occur. This multiplicity necessitates a difference in time/space otherwise they would be one. There cannot be multiple "sum of all things", as necessitated by making a statement of equality, other wise there would be something beyond one sum (i.e. the other sum). But this point can be ignored. This point cannot:

The sum of all things is one thing and this one thing has no comparison, as it is the 'sum of all things' and cannot have anything beyond it, therefore "the sum of all things" is an empty statement as it is formless because it is absent of comparison.

Another point: the fact that there are parts which work together, to form the whole, necessitates all the parts working as one and as 'working as one' makes any differentiation of one part from another completely an artificial construct that is illusionary in nature. To observe a thing is to observe a relative truth and as relative results in contradiction as it is simultaneous true and false under the totality of contexts it exists through. In other terms "thingness" is an illusion.

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

For the record the only major detail we are disagreeing with is "no-thingness/nothingness"...

Yes.

It appears you are equating nothingness with whole/no parts.

I am equating nothingness with no existence.

As stated our definitions are different so we will fundamentally disagree on basis of definition.

Or at least *appear* to disagree on basis of definition.

Two parties could be conveying the same logical idea but if their terms and definitions do not coincide they will appear completely at odds often to the point of absurdity. That seems applicable in this situation.

Personally I wouldn't use the term "nothingness" to indicate wholeness just as I wouldn't use the term "area of nothingness" to indicate immaterial expanse.

OF COURSE you would NOT use 'that term', BECAUSE IF you DID, then you would REFUTE your OTHER 'terms', 'statements', AND CLAIMS.

Also, will 'you' provide 'us' WITH ANY 'term' that 'you' WOULD USE to indicate 'immaterial expanse'?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

I would use "wholeness" to indicate wholeness and "immaterial expanse" to indicate immaterial expanse.

Now, are there ANY 'material things' WITH-IN 'material expanse'?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

This is how subjects become confused and terms and ideas misconstrued.

EXACTLY, and thus WHY 'you' ARE FAILING ABSOLUTELY here.

That is; you ARE MAKING CLAIMS, which you OBVIOUSLY can NOT back up and support.

SEE, if one WANTS TO Truly DESCRIBE the ACTUAL Truth of 'things', EXACTLY AS 'they' ARE, then USING MISCONSTRUED terms and/or ideas of what ACTUALLY EXISTS WILL NEVER WORK, as the last few human millennia or so HAS PROVED, IRREFUTABLY.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

Thus why it is crucial to have direct, structured terms and premises.

LOL
LOL
LOL

BUT, structure 'terms' and/or 'premises' to FIT IN WITH one's OWN ALREADY OBTAINED and HELD ONTO BELIEFS does NOT WORK, and ONLY TWISTS, DISTORTS, and MISCONSTRUES 'things' here. As 'you', "daniel j lavender", are LIVING PROOF OF.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

That said I will continue to approach your statements with the terms defined in the original text.

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

3. There is no separation between nothingness and being as nothingness has no distinctions within it to separate it from being.

There is seemingly no separation between nothingness and being because nothingness is not there.

All that is is being so the idea of nothingness must be fashioned in its image.

If there was nothingness we would not be having this conversation.

What IS ACTUALLY True IS, If there was ONLY nothingness, then 'we' would NOT be having 'this conversation'.

JUST LIKE, IF there was ONLY 'one thing', then 'we' ALSO would NOT be having 'this conversation', NEITHER.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

Nothingness, for a lack of a better phrase, must be fashioned to the coattails of existence because all there *is* existence.

BUT, just BECAUSE it may well be true that 'all there is' is 'Existence' does in NO WAY MEAN NOR INFER that 'nothingness', itself, can NOT exist.

you appear to have some sort of DISTORTED VIEW, or DISTORTED THINKING, that there can ONLY EVER BE ALL OF 'NO thing' or ALL OF 'SOME thing'.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

One must try to mix, one must try to blend nothingness in with existence to make nothingness seem real or actual. Nothingness is not.

'you', "daniel j lavender", could NOT PROVIDE a BETTER nor MORE CLEARER PICTURE of a human being STUCK IN and WITH A BELIEF, as 'you' ARE here now. Which, by the way, 'we' THANK 'you' FOR.

'you' ARE SHOWING the rest of 'us' what NOT TO DO, as well as PROVING, EXACTLY, WHY doing, what 'you' ARE here, LED UP TO the DOWNFALL of the human being.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

4. "Existence is" is an empty statement that has no definite meaning. The point that existence is infinite makes existence indefinite and as indefinite is formless

"Existence is" is a universal statement.

Thus;

"Existence is" *is* an empty statement.

"Existence is" is a *complete* statement.

"Existence is" is a *specific* statement.

"Existence is" is a *general* statement.

Existence is green. Existence is purple. Existence is blue. Existence is windy. Existence is humid.

The terms are all interchangeable, the statement virtually of complete versatility as existence *is* all and all *is* existence:

The leaf is green. The tie is purple. The sky is blue. Chicago is windy. The weather is humid.

The terms interchanged once more:

The leaf is existence. The tie is existence. The sky is existence. Chicago is existence. Weather is existence.

All phrases work, all connotation correct and congruent as existence *is* all, existence *is* each and every thing. Whatever it is, it is existence. Existence is.

As stated "existence is" is a universal statement, a universal premise. "Existence is" is the ultimate statement of ultimate versatility. "Existence is" *does* have definite meaning and definite connotation but it also has indefinite meaning and indefinite connotation. Existence is infinite, existence is unlimited. Existence concerns both definite and indefinite.

“ Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

...as formless it is no-thing.

As expressed existence is omnifarious, existence is of *all forms not no form*.

Existence is formless in that sense as discussed here: [viewtopic.php?p=652950#p652950](#)

In other words existence would be formless in the sense of *all-things*, not formless in the sense of *no-thing*.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by daniel j lavender » Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am

“ Age wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 22, 2023 12:38 pm

That is: 'existence IS existence' SOLELY BECAUSE 'it IS'.

Correct.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 22, 2023 12:38 pm

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

You're basically saying:



daniel j lavender

Posts: 129
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact: [✉](#)

Age wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 5:45 am

The universe consists of two fundamental things, because the universe could NOT exist without two fundamental things. Fundamental things are fundamental things and there is NOTHING MORE needed to be known here.

The CIRCULAR REASONING, with both, IS THE SAME.

I have NEVER even thought, let alone EVER suggest, thus NEVER even SAID NOR WROTE ABSOLUTELY ANY 'thing' like 'this' here.

ONCE AGAIN, you have ALLOWED your OWN MADE UP ASSUMPTIONS to GET the BETTER OF 'you', and HAVE DRIFTED OFF, AGAIN, on some TANGENT OF your OWN MAKING.

So, ONCE AGAIN, I WILL REPEAT it will be BETTER FOR you TO SEEK OUT and OBTAIN ACTUAL CLARITY BEFORE you BEGIN to START ASSUMING 'these' Truly RIDICULOUSLY STUPID CLAIMS, which ARE OF your OWN IMAGINATION, and WORSE STILL ARE now OF your OWN BELIEFS and BELIEVING.

ALSO, I WILL NOTE, AGAIN, that YOUR VERY DECEITFUL WAYS here are BEING NOTICED. So, PLEASE REFRAIN FROM attributing 'things' that I HAVE NEVER SAID, NOR have even 'thought' AND QUOTING 'them' as though I SAID 'it'.

That's your statement. I simply substituted a few words to illustrate how the statement self applies.

Age wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 22, 2023 1:39 pm

Now, are there ANY 'material things' WITH-IN 'material expanse'?

I've not used the term "material expanse". That term does not appear in the original text nor in my comments.

Material things such as physical objects are categorized as *materiality*.

Immaterial things such as immaterial expanse are categorized as *immateriality*.

It's that simple.

This has already been discussed: viewtopic.php?p=652086#p652086

Age wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 22, 2023 1:39 pm

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 11:43 am

Eodnhøj7 wrote: ↑

Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm

3. There is no separation between nothingness and being as nothingness has no distinctions within it to separate it from being.

There is seemingly no separation between nothingness and being because nothingness is not there.

All that is being so the idea of nothingness must be fashioned in its image.

If there was nothingness we would not be having this conversation.

What IS ACTUALLY True IS, If there was ONLY nothingness, then 'we' would NOT be having 'this conversation'.

"Only nothingness" is another oxymoronic term.

In the context used it suggests there can be something other than nothingness; it suggests nothingness is dispersed throughout being.

If there is something, if there is *any thing at all* there is *not* nothingness.

Suggesting there is nothingness *and* things is nonsensical.

Age wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 22, 2023 1:39 pm

JUST LIKE, IF there was ONLY 'one thing', then 'we' ALSO would NOT be having 'this conversation', NEITHER.

That's the point: There isn't only one thing.

There isn't nothingness.

Age wrote: ↑

Sat Jul 22, 2023 1:39 pm

'you', "daniel j lavender", could NOT PROVIDE a BETTER nor MORE CLEARER PICTURE of a human being STUCK IN and WITH A BELIEF, as 'you' ARE here now. Which, by the way, 'we' THANK 'you' FOR.

'you' ARE SHOWING the rest of 'us' what NOT TO DO, as well as PROVING, EXACTLY, WHY doing, what 'you' ARE here, LED UP TO the DOWNFALL of the human being.

Because the text and statements presented do not align with your beliefs and terminology?

So you attempt to scrutinize and criticize as you possess the correct knowledge and method?

Wouldn't that make *you* guilty of the very acts of which I'm accused?

Age wrote: ↑

Wed Jun 21, 2023 3:55 pm

I could NOT be bothered reading past the sub-heading - Existence is Eternal.

I suggest reading the remainder of the essay. Perhaps that will clarify things for you and allow actual discussion of the topics at hand.

The point of defining terms, the point of producing and presenting a structured essay is to convey an idea. A complete idea. A coherent, cohesive idea.

You are not conveying a complete idea.

You have not produced nor presented a structured, comprehensive text. You are merely arguing with and scrutinizing others' ideas and statements. You've not even defined any terms so readers will know what you're talking about. Do you even know what you're talking about?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am



Age

Posts: 16527

Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am